



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,377	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14970US02	6852
23446 7590 06/23/2010 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2444				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/675,377

**Applicant(s)**

KARAOGUZ ET AL.

**Examiner**

Scott Christensen

**Art Unit**

2444

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 3/15/2010.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/15/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. On pages 11-12, Applicant argues the examiner's interpretation of RadioShack. More specifically, Applicant argues that the A-B switch only outputs one signal at a time.

However, the switch, as shown in the figure, was not relied upon. Rather, the modulator device itself is what was relied on. As can be seen on page 3, under "Selecting the Channel," the channel selected must not be used for transmission of data, and there must be at least two non-interfering channels immediately below the selected channel and at least one non-interfering channel immediately above it. Therefore, it is clear that the modulator of RadioShack is capable of combining the output signal with another signal, and thus the possible interference from the other signal must be accounted for.

Further, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the common nature of RF modulators, and the use of the RF modulator, such as that in RadioShack, to allow the connection of electronic devices to a television while combining the signal with a television. For example, the Nintendo Entertainment System, which was released in the United States in 1985, included an RF modulator, which features an input coaxial port, and input port from the gaming console, and an output port for the television, and

included a switch which allowed the user to choose either channel 3 or channel 4. This would allow an input from an antenna or a cable company to be displayed on most channels, but the selected channel would instead be displayed from the gaming console.

4. On pages 12-13, Applicant broadly challenges the findings of Official Notice, stating that the Official Notice is "considering individual elements in a vacuum instead of considering elements in the context of the claimed invention as a whole." However, this appears to be simply a broad challenge, without specifically pointing out any specific errors in the examiners action (See MPEP 2144.03 C). Thus, in cases where no specific arguments were presented, no documentary evidence is needed at this time. Further, the argument of components being considered in a

5. On page 13, Applicant argues the motivation provided by the Examiner with respect to "having a file with metadata that has information on a media of highest quality" being well known in the art.

US 6,353,929 to Houston teaches the inclusion of metadata with a media object that includes "the URL and other information indicating the source of the corresponding media object" (Column 23, lines 20-28).

Thus, it would have been well known to have the metadata include the source of the media object. Further, the media content is adapted to have a lower quality than the original media object for transportation of the media (see the rejection of claim 1),

meaning that the media object with the highest quality, from the standpoint of the system, would be located at the source, as the instant claim does not provide any requirement that the media content before adaption is different than the highest quality media content.

Further, the Applicant asks the question of "why stream the adapted media if you are going to download the file?" This was presented in the motivation to provide for a situation which a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize as being a possibility. Streaming content has the advantage that storage does not need to be provided for the content, and the user may view the material immediately. Further, the user may utilize a device that the media content cannot be stored on (at least at the non-adapted highest quality level) due to space constraints. Thus, the user may wish to play the media content immediately, and if the user likes it, then download the higher quality file. This is similar as a person views a program on the television or listens to a song on the radio, then later buys the content on a disc or tape or otherwise downloads the content.

6. On pages 14-15, Applicant argues the application of Reynolds with regard to the arrangement of the components within the private homes.

First, it is noted that Applicant misquotes the Examiner on page 15. It was not said that it was "known that servers are external to homes." Rather, it was stated that it was "known to have...the server being external to the homes." The distinction between

the two statements lies in the fact that it was known to have servers inside (private, home servers) and outside of homes (public servers).

It is noted that the language concerning the locations of the components with respect to the first and second private homes does nothing to modify the functionality of the equipment. Thus, the locations would constitute a mere rearrangement of parts with absolutely no effect on the functionality of the claimed invention (MPEP 2144.04 VI C). Further, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the location of the component would be largely impacted by the owner of the component and/or agreements with the owners of the equipment. For example, if a user owns a server, the server would most likely be in the users home. If a company owns the server, the server would most likely be some other location.

The only functionality associated with the components being in the first home, the second home, and external to the homes would be the relative location of the components, where the first, second, and third components are geographically remote from each other. However, once again, the components being in a private home or in a different location does not modify the functionality of the components, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize advantages to having the components in private homes or in a public area based on ownership of the components and/or agreements associated with the components.

7. Applicant's remaining arguments appear to either rely on the infallibility of Applicant's arguments presented on pages 11-15, or arguing that elements are considered in a vacuum (e.g. page 16).

With regard to Applicant's arguments of viewing components from a vacuum, it is noted that as per MPEP 2144.03, many facts can be Officially Noticed (It is noted that almost any fact that was, in fact, well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art can be Officially Noticed, as per MPEP 2144.03). In fact, most of the time, when a limitation is reviewed in light of the prior art, the component itself, and the recitation of how the individual component is known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, whether Officially Noticed or cited in reference, can be seen as being taken in a vacuum when the citation of what was known is also viewed in a vacuum. However, when a claim has no individual elements, that when taken "in a vacuum," that were not known in the art, whether a claim as a whole is found to be obvious or not lies within the reasoning for combining the different components. This reasoning, for example, may take the form of a statement of the motivation to combine the elements. It is noted that on page 16, Applicant fails to address the motivation for utilizing satellite and DSL headends.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds et al. in US Patent Application Publication US 2004/0045030, hereafter referred to as "Reynolds" in view of 15-1243.A5.fm from RadioShack, published September 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "RadioShack."

10. With regard to claim 1, Reynolds discloses a system for adapting media content, comprising:

a first communications device disposed in the location first, the first communications device being operatively coupled to a network (Reynolds: Figure 4A, Client), the device profile relating to the first communication device (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]); and

the second communications device disposed in the second location, the second communications device being operatively coupled to the network, the second communications device receiving the updated device profile relating to the first communications device, adapting media content based upon the device profile of the first communications device, and sending, in a private, non-broadcast channel, the adapted media content to the first communications device (Reynolds: Figure 4A, Processor and Paragraph [0211].),

wherein the private, non-broadcast channels displayed in the first private home comprise the private, non-broadcast channel sent by the second communication device and private, non-broadcast channels originating from the first communication device (Reynolds: Figure 4A. As the information is sent to the first communication device to display, the display of the first communication device includes both the information sent



to it from the second communication device as well as information originating from the first communication device.).

However, Reynolds does not disclose expressly that the method is performed in a media exchange network comprising a media exchange server, a network, a first private home and a second private home, the media exchange server being external to the first private home and to the second private home,

that the first communication device updates a device profile within the first communications device, the first communications device automatically sends the updated device profile to a second communications device,

that the first location is in a first private home,

that the second location is in a second private home,

a file is sent with the media content,

wherein the first communications device uses a TV channel guide look-and-feel user interface to display private, non-broadcast channels and public broadcast channels, or

wherein the adapted media content is set to a first quality that is lower than a second quality level that is supported by the first communications device, and

wherein the file comprises information as to where the media content of a highest quality level resides outside of the first private home and the second private home.

However, Official Notice (See MPEP 2144.03) is taken that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to have the locations being private homes and the

server being external to the homes. Official Notice is further taken that having a file with metadata that has information on media of the highest quality was well known in the art.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to modify Reynolds with the well known functionality.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that having a file that includes information on where the original file is located allows a content publisher to receive full credit for the work. Having this file staying with the media content even when the quality of the media content is adjusted by another party ensures that the original publisher maintains credit for the work. Further, this allows copyright protection to be maintained. The file also would allow the content to be downloaded as opposed to streamed, so that a user who decides to view the content at a later time can utilize the file to receive the downloaded version. As the speed requirement for transmission of a downloaded file are less constraining than the requirements for streaming, the downloaded file can have a higher quality. Further, the location of the components does not appear to impact the functionality of the system. Having the locations being private homes allows private users to utilize the system, and having the server outside of the homes allows a commercial entity to provide services to the users.

Further, RadioShack discloses that combining broadcast signals into a single connection, which is then viewed using the same interface (such as public broadcast channels and private channels) was well known in the art (RadioShack: Page 1). Devices called RF Modulators performed this functionality by taking an input signal (public television), then modulating a private signal (VCR, game console, etc.) with the

input signal, which is then input into a television. The RF Modulator is configured to input the signal into a designated channel, such as channel 3 or channel 4, as was commonly performed in North America. Thus, when the user utilizes the television, the non-designated channels display any information associated with the channel from the input signal, and the designated channel displays the private information.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to modify Reynolds with the functionality of an RF modulator to result in the first communication device using a TV channel guide look-and-feel user interface to display private, non-broadcast channels and public broadcast channels.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that by utilizing an RF modulator, the streamed content could be input into a wider variety of televisions. Most televisions at the time included a coaxial input, which was commonly used by public broadcast channel inputs, such as that provided by many cable television companies. Meanwhile, other inputs, while on many televisions, were not on as many televisions as the coaxial input. Thus, by using a coaxial connection, televisions that could not otherwise display content from the communications devices would be capable of doing so. However, without an RF modulator of some sort, the content could not be viewed through the same connection as regular broadcast channel content. Thus, utilizing an RF modulator (whether embedded in the communications device, as was the case with many VCR devices or as a separate device) would allow a television to utilize a single coaxial connection to view both regular broadcast channels and the signals from the communications devices.

11. With regard to claim 2, Reynolds as modified by RadioShack teaches:

that the first communications device is coupled to the network via a first headend (Reynolds: Figure 8. The components are connected to networks. A headend, as claimed, appears to be the interface that enables the device to be connected to a network. As the devices of Reynolds are connected to the network, they have a headend.), and

that the second communications device is coupled to the network via a second headend (Reynolds: Figure 8. The components are connected to networks. A headend, as claimed, appears to be the interface that enables the device to be connected to a network. As the devices of Reynolds are connected to the network, they have a headend.).

However, Reynolds does not disclose expressly that the first headend is a satellite headend and that the second headend is a DSL headend.

However, Official Notice is taken satellite headends and DSL headends were well known in the art.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have the headends of Reynolds being a satellite and DSL headend.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that allowing Reynolds to utilize satellite and DSL headends allows the users to utilize interfaces that the users likely already possess to utilize the system of Reynolds. Further, satellite and DSL

headends would utilize an infrastructure that is already in place in most areas to implement the network of Reynolds.

12. With regard to claim 3, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that at least one of the first communications device and the second communications device comprise a software platform that can provide a user-interface functionality, a distributed storage functionality and a networking functionality (Reynolds: Figure 8. The devices are connected to at least one network, and thus have networking functionality. Further, as seen in paragraph [0155], a distributed storage functionality may be performed, either with regard to the video or with regard to the CODECS. Finally, as seen in Figure 10, browsing may occur via the set-top box, meaning that a user-friendly interface may be provided. Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly reflect the function of each of these functionalities, including how the functionalities are provided.).

13. With regard to claim 4, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that at least one of the first communications device and the second communications device comprises a software platform that can provide device registration, channel setup, program setup, management and security (Reynolds: Paragraph [0144]. PDAs, which can be used with the system of Reynolds, can perform some sort of managing functions. Further, as per the rejection of claim 1, channel setup clearly occurs, as the content is displayed in a channel. According to Reynolds, paragraph [211], the

programs are set up according to the profile. Finally, as a profile is utilized, the device is clearly registered in some manner. As with the rejection of claim 3, above, Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly reflect the function of each of these functionalities, including how the functionalities are provided.).

14. With regard to claim 5, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that at least one of the first communications device and the second communications device is adapted to provide a distributed networking capability, an archival functionality, a temporary storage capability, a storage manager (Reynolds: Paragraph [0144]. PDAs, which can be used with the system of Reynolds, can store files, so this constitutes at least either a temporary storage capability or an archival functionality. Further, as seen in Figure 8, the internet may be utilized, thus a distributed network functionality is performed.). However, Reynolds does not disclose expressly that one of the devices is adapted to provide a digital rights manager.

However, Official Notice is taken that digital rights managers were well known in the art.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to provide a digital rights manager.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that illegal distribution of media is a problem, as companies are not being paid for the distribution of their content, meaning that sells become reduced. Further, the user may create a situation where the user may become liable for "damages" due to the distribution of the content. By providing some digital rights management functionality, the illegal distribution of

content may be reduced, thus allowing the companies that own the rights to the media to obtain their rightful compensation for the distribution of the media, and preventing liability on the part of the user through the illegal distribution of content.

15. With regard to claim 6, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the device profile comprises information related to digital media parameters (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]).

16. With regard to claim 7, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the information related to the digital media parameters comprises information related to at least one of resolution and display size (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]).

17. With regard to claim 8, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the device profile comprises information related to media capabilities of the first device (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]).

18. With regard to claim 9, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that at least one of the first communications device and the second communications device comprises a display that facilitates viewing and interacting with a user interface, media, data and services available on the network (Reynolds: Figure 10. The display of Reynolds makes facilitates all functionalities performed by the communications device. Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly reflect how the facilitation occurs.).

19. With regard to claim 10, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the first communications device requests the media from the second communications device via the network (Reynolds: Paragraph [0229]).

20. With regard to claim 11, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the second communication device sends, in a second private, non-broadcast channel, personal video (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]. A video signal is sent.) and wherein the first communication device uses the TV channel guide look-and-feel user interface to display the second private, non-broadcast channel (Reynolds: As per the rejection of claim 1, above, the signals are modulated in the proposed combination). However, Reynolds does not disclose that the second communications device sends in a first private, non-broadcast channel, personal pictures or in a third private, non-broadcast channel, personal music.

However, Official Notice is taken that distribution of personal pictures and personal music was well known in the art. Further, it would have been well known to utilize a channel for these functionalities (such as a camera could be connected to a television through an RF modulator, as could music).

Thus, it would have been obvious to have the second communications device sends in a first private, non-broadcast channel, personal pictures or in a third private, non-broadcast channel, personal music.



The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that allowing the distribution of music and personal pictures over the same network as the video allows the user to share personal pictures as well as music with others, as well as allowing the user to view these on a different display, where the display is associated with the first communications device.

21. With regard to claim 12, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the device profile comprises one or more digital parameters to set to a quality lower than a maximum quality level supported by the first communications device (Reynolds: Paragraph [0211]).

22. With regard to claim 13, Reynolds teaches the invention as substantially claimed except:

wherein the second communications device creates private media channels relating to particular content residing in the second communications device, and wherein the second communications device pushes the private media channels from the second private home to authorized devices in the media exchange network.

However, Official Notice is taken that streaming content over networks, in a manner similar to a radio or television broadcast, was well known in the art. For instance, internet radio stations already existed. Further, it would have been well known to create permissions for content, and send the content only to those who have the authorization to access the content.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to allow the second communications device to create a private media channels, and push the channels to authorized devices.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that allowing users to publish their own streams allows user generated content and/or play lists to be enjoyed by friends and family. This further greatly expands on content available over a network, as any user can create content to be shared with others.

23. With regard to claim 14, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the file comprises a meta file associated with the media content (Meta data is interpreted as simply being data about data, where a meta file would be a file with data about data. In this case, the data transmitted is data about the original media presentation, and is thus data about data.).

24. With regard to claim 15, the instant claim is substantially similar to the subject matter of claim 1, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

25. With regard to claim 16, Reynolds as modified by Radioshack teaches that the second communications device adapts one or more digital parameters of the media content based upon the device profile of the first communications device (Reynolds: Paragraphs [0211] and [0254]).

26. With regard to claim 17, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 1, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons. Further, Reynolds teaches that the communications device is a set-top box (Reynolds: Paragraph [0111])

27. With regard to claim 18, the instant claim is substantially similar to subject matter found in claim 1, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

28. With regard to claim 19, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 15, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

29. With regard to claim 20, Reynolds teaches the invention as substantially claimed except that the set-top box system is replaced with a communications device that stores a revisable device profile of the communications device, and wherein the communications device automatically sends the revisable device profile of the communications device to the network, and wherein the communications device receives a file associated with the media content and the media content that has been adapted based upon the sent device profile of the communications device.

However, Official Notice is taken that it was well known to replace devices, and install the new device in a network.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to modify Reynolds with the functionality of claim 20.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the method of claim 20 appears to simply be the steps required to install and operate a new device in place of the communications device of claim 17. There are many reasons to replace the device, such as a malfunction or an upgrade. Then, allowing the functionality of claim 20 with respect to the new device would allow the new device to function in the network as the old device did.

30. With regard to claim 21, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 1, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

31. With regard to claim 22, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 17, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

32. With regard to claim 23, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 6, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

33. With regard to claim 24, Reynolds, as currently applied, teaches the invention as substantially claimed except that the media content of the highest quality level resides in the network, but external to the first home and the second home.

However, Official Notice is taken that it would have been well known to have the original file within the same network, but in a separate location.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have the media content of the highest quality level resides in the network, but external to the first home and the second home.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that for the file to be accessed through the network, it must be connected somehow to the network. It is noted that the location of the file does not appear to affect the functionality of the instant claim. It is also noted that the location of the second file could be a third home, a private or public server, a store, etc, meaning that any location in the network, even a third home, would meet the claim limitation. Further, the term "network," as currently claimed, can include the entire Internet, meaning that the file would simply have to be somewhere on the Internet to meet the claim limitation. Accordingly, any storage location of the file external to the first or second home, and on the Internet (where the first and second home are connected to each other through the Internet) meets the claim limitation.

34. With regard to claim 25, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 13, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons. Further, it would have been well known to have the channel relating to content residing in the second communication device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have the channel relating to content in the second communication device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that utilizing networks, drives existing on one system can be mapped as drives on a second system, where the drive is accessed by the user in a manner similar to a local drive. Thus, a private

channel, where a storage device in the second location is mapped to a drive in the first location, would be able to access the files in the drive as if the files existed in the first location.

35. With regard to claim 26, the instant claim is substantially similar to claim 15, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

36. With regard to claim 27-28, the instant claim is substantially similar to subject matter presented in claim 1, and is rejected for substantially similar reasons.

37. With regard to claim 29, Reynolds as modified by RadioShack, as currently presented, does not teach expressly:

replacing the communications device with a second communications device;  
storing, in the second communications device, a revisable device profile of the second communications device, the second communications device being operatively coupled to the network;  
automatically sending the revisable device profile of the second communications device to the network; and  
receiving, from the network, a file associated with the media content that has been adapted based upon the sent revisable device profile of the second communications device.

However, Official Notice is taken that it was well known to replace devices, and install the new device in a network.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to modify Reynolds with the functionality of claim 29.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the method of claim 29 appears to simply be the steps required to install and operate a new device in place of the communications device of claim 27. There are many reasons to replace the device, such as a malfunction or an upgrade. Then, performing the method of claim 27 with respect to the new device (which appears to be the functionality performed by claim 29) would allow the new device to function in the network as the old device did.

***Conclusion***

38. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571)270-1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444  
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444